

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CINDY HALABURDA, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BAUER PUBLISHING CO., LP, a
Delaware partnership,

Defendant.

_____ /

DAVID GRENKE, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HEARST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
a Delaware Corporation,

Defendant

_____ /

SUSAN FOX, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TIME, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

Defendant.

_____ /

Case No. 12-CV-12831

HON. GEORGE CARAM STEEH

Case No. 12-CV-14221

HON. DAVID M. LAWSON

Case No. 12-CV-14390

HON. GERSHWIN A. DRAIN

CONDITIONAL ORDER OF REASSIGNMENT

Defendants in the three cases captioned above have moved for reassignment of two cases, both pending in the Eastern District of Michigan, citing E.D. Mich. LR 83.11(b)(2).¹ Those cases, also putative class actions filed after the Halaburda case captioned above, are Grenke v. Hearst Communications, Inc., case no. 12-14221 (Hon. David M. Lawson), and Fox v. Time, Inc., case no. 12-14390 (Hon. Gershwin A. Drain). As set forth below, the court hereby grants the motions (Doc. # 30 in case no. 12-12831; Doc. # 19 in case no. 12-14221; and Doc. # 23 in case no. 12-14390).

Motions to dismiss are also pending in all three cases, which raise common questions of law. For reasons of judicial efficiency, as contemplated by E.D. Mich. LR 83.11(b)(3), reassignment of the Grenke and Fox matters to the docket of the Hon. George C. Steeh will be effected promptly upon issuance of this order. Such reassignment is for the limited purpose of coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings for which joint resolution furthers judicial economy and consistency, as determined by the court. After a final determination of the motions to dismiss, and at such time that the court determines a coordinated or consolidated administration of the cases is no longer required to promote judicial efficiency, the matters may be reassigned back to the originally assigned district judges by order of the court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

¹Briefing on that motion is complete, and the court will determine the motion without oral argument pursuant to E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(e)(2).

Dated: January 8, 2013

s/George Caram Steeh
GEORGE CARAM STEEH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

s/David M. Lawson
DAVID M. LAWSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

s/Gershwin A. Drain
GERSHWIN A. DRAIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Approved for Entry: January 8, 2013

S/Gerald E. Rosen
GERALD E. ROSEN
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE